DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 904 HE 003 871

TITLE	Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs. A Discussion Paper for the Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	52p.; Resource group 6 report, document no. 14
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; *Statewide Planning; *Transfer Policy; *Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

This document presents a report of the resource group on a transfer of students among institutions and programs for the master plan of higher education in the state of Connecticut. The group attempts to isolate a category of transfer problems, those involving graduates from transfer curricula at regional community colleges, and to demonstrate that the transfer process in the selected category can be eased substantially. The recommendations are aimed specifically at removing the current barriers that impede smooth transition from a transfer curriculum at a community college to a baccalaureate program at a 4-year institution. The recommendations cover such basic problems as the assignment of credit earned in courses, admission priorities, and the quality of student services. (HS)

ED 074904

TRANSFER

TRANSFER OF STUDENTS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS

The Report of

RESOURCE GROUP VI

A Discussion Paper for the

MASTER PLAN FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Document #14
February 1973

Note: This report is the work of the Resource Group; the reader is reminded that the recommendations made in this report are not necessarily opinions or positions of the Commission for Higher Education or any other group.

HE 003 871

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

P.O. Box 1320 - Hartford, Connecticut 06101

AREA CODE 203 566-3913

February, 1973

To the Reader:

The 1972 General Assembly passed Public Act 194 which directed the Commission for Higher Education to develop a Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut by January 1974. In response, the Commission determined a structure designed to insure broadly based participation in the development of the plan. An overview of that structure is contained in the following document.

One of the most important elements of the Master Plan structure is the Resource Groups. Since September 1972, these groups, made up of over two hundred persons, have addressed themselves to major topics for the Master Plan. The reports of these groups have been made available to public boards of higher education with the request that the reports be disseminated to the chief executives and to the chief librarians of each institution and that the broadest discussion possible of the resource groups' topics be encouraged among faculty, students and interested groups. In addition, copies are being made available through public libraries and to organizations and governmental agencies which might be interested. Because the supply of the reports is limited, any interested individuals are permitted to reproduce any or all reports.

This report is one of eight Resource Group Reports. It should be recognized that the topics assigned to the Resource Groups are not mutually exclusive.. Therefore, the reader is encouraged to read all eight reports.

The Commission for Higher Education is most grateful to the many individuals who gave freely of their time and energies serving on Resource Groups. The excellent groundwork they have provided in their reports will facilitate the deliberations of additional groups and individuals as the process of the Master Plan development continues.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Donald H. McGannon, Chairman, New Canaan
James J. Dutton, Jr., Norwich
Henry F. Fagan, Stratford
Miss Anne M. Hogan, Putnam
Miss Helen M. Hogan, Cheshire
Robert J. Jeffries, Westport
Mrs. Norma A. Jorgensen, Newington
Miss Margaret Kiely, Bridgeport
Mrs. Bernice Niejadlik, Danielson
Mrs. Irene Novak, Westport
John R. Reitemeyer, Barkhamsted
William J. Sanders, ex officio, West Hartford
The Reverend Herbert Smith, Hartford
Orville J. Sweeting, New Haven
Sister Mary Theodore, West Hartford

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Gordon W. Tasker, Chairman, Hartford
Merlin D. Bishop, West Hartford
Mrs. Eugene D. Jones, Wilton
Mrs. Albert N. Jorgensen, Jr., Newington
Walter B. Kozloski, Farmington
Mrs. Conrad J. Kronholm, Jr., Hartford
John M. Lupton, Wallingford
John T. Macdonald, Hartford
Joseph R. McCormick, Wethersfield
The Honorable Thomas J. Meskill, Hartford
Carl W. Nielsen, Hartford
William J. Sanders, Hartford
Charles Stroh, Hartford
Robert F. Taylor, Hartford
W. DeHomer Waller, New Haven

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR STATE COLLEGES

Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik, Chairman, Danielson
Frank Cammarano, New Haven
James E. Dyer, Danbury
Richard Gurney, Lakeville
Francis W. Hogan, Torrington
Ernest A. Johnson, Hamden
Miss Laura Johnson, Hartford
Ramon M. Martinez, Middletown
Marcus R. McCraven, New Haven
James F. McNally, Hartford
John F. Robinson, West Hartford
Alvin B. Woods, Bloomfield

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Henry F. Fagan, Chairman, Stratford
Roger B. Bagley, Manchester
Robert P. Giannini, Bridgeport
Mrs. Elizabeth Joyner, Winsted
Paul Mali, Groton
Mrs. Dorothy C. McNulty, West Hartford
Marcos Ocasio, New Haven
Vincent J. Scamporino, Middletown
Mrs. Beryl Strout, Wallingford
W. Lonsdale Taylor, Woodstock Valley
Mrs. Marjorie Terrell, West Hartford
Max R. Traurig, Waterbury

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGES

William Horowitz, Chairman, New Haven
Thomas G. Carruthers, Vernon
Mrs. Virginia D. Christian, Norwich
Mrs. Betty Lou Dorin, Berlin
G. Eugene Goundrey, Middletown
Mrs. Jane Dargan Humphries, West Hartford
Miss Margaret Kiely, Bridgeport
Nicholas A. Longo, Putnam
John E. Toffolon, Riverton

MANAGEMENT/POLICY GROUP

Henry E. Fagan, Chairman
Board of Trustees Regional Community Colleges
Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik, Chairman
Board of Trustees State Colleges
William Horowitz, Chairman
Board of Trustees State Technical Colleges
Gordon W. Tasker, Chairman
Board of Trustees University of Connecticut
Donald H. McGannon, Chairman
Commission for Higher Education
Robert A. Kidera, President
Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Executive and General Assembly Liaison

Representative Howard M. Klebanoff
Stuart Smith, Office of the Governor
Senator Ruth O. Truex

REVIEW AND EVALUATION GROUP

Samuel M. Brownell
Consultant on Urban Education, Yale University
John J. Driscoll, President
Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO
The Reverend Edwin R. Edmonds
Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church, New Haven
Theodore F. Hogan, Jr., Chairman
State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, New Haven
Arthur Howe, Lyme
Carmine R. Lavieri
Secretary, Connecticut Bar Association, Winsted
Ms. Laura M. Pope, Executive Director
Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Inc., Hartford
Dennen Reilley, West Hartford Public Schools, West Hartford
Mabel Murphy Smythe, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York
Arthur L. Woods, President
Connecticut Business and Industry Association, Inc., Hartford

Ex-officio Members

Adolf G. Carlson, Commissioner
Department of Finance and Control
Ruben Figueroa, Commissioner
Department of Community Affairs
Mrs. Gloria Schaffer, Secretary of State

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM PROJECT TEAM

Dorothy Goodwin, The University of Connecticut
Cletus Clow, State Colleges
Kenneth Summerer, Regional Community Colleges
Joseph Karporwich, State Technical Colleges
Francis Degnan, Commission for Higher Education

George Hall, IBM
Charles Lounsbury, IBM
Roger Kalar, IBM

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION STAFF

Warren G. Hill, Chancellor
Louis Rabineau, Vice Chancellor; Director, Program Planning
Francis J. Degnan, Director, Research and Publications
R. Kent Fielding, Associate in Higher Education
Margaret A. Duffy, Associate in Higher Education
Mary Ellen Stanwick, Special Assistant
Linwood Robinson, Special Consultant
Josephine Cauley, typist

MASTER PLAN STAFF ASSOCIATES

David Basch, Board of Trustees for State Colleges
Brian H. Burke, University of Connecticut
Joseph Dunn, Central Connecticut State College
W. Lewis Hyde, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges
Stanley Macklow, Norwalk State Technical College
Bernard Shea, Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges
Sally A. Morgan, University of Connecticut

INTRODUCTION

The following report has been prepared by the Resource Group for consideration by the Commission for Higher Education as it develops a Master Plan for higher education in Connecticut. To insure clear understanding of this report a number of points should be emphasized:

- The findings and recommendations are the considered judgment of the individual Resource Group. They do not necessarily represent an opinion or position of the Commission for Higher Education or any other group such as the Management/Policy or Review and Evaluation Group.

- This report is one of eight reports. The Resource Group reports, as a whole, are position papers for consideration in the development of the Master Plan. They should not be construed as constituting a first draft of the Master Plan. Subsequent to further discussion and comment, the recommendations made in reports may be retained, revised, or deleted in the Master Plan.

- The recommendations of the group may conflict with recommendations made by other groups. The reconciliation of conflicting recommendations will be considered in the process of developing a draft Master Plan.

- The development of a Master Plan is a dynamic process requiring continuing input from many sources. Although the Resource Group reports provide an important source of judgments about the elements of the plan, additional reaction, comment, and thought is required before an initial draft of the Master Plan can be completed.

All questions and comments concerning this report should be addressed to Master Plan Staff Associates, c/o The Commission for Higher Education, P. O. Box 1320, Hartford, Connecticut 06101.

PROCESS OF THE MASTER PLAN

Groups Involved in the Master Plan

I. Commission for Higher Education: The State's coordinating agency for higher education was requested by the General Assembly (P.A. 194, 1972) to develop, in cooperation with the boards of trustees of the constituent units of the public system, a Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut. The plan is to be completed and submitted to the General Assembly by January, 1974.

II. Management/Policy Groups: A steering committee for the Master Plan process; membership consists of the chairmen of the boards of trustees for the constituent units, and the president of the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. Liaison representation from the Governor's office and from the General Assembly are also represented.

III. Resource Groups: These groups are charged with developing position papers on specific topics for utilization in the development of a Master Plan. Membership is proportionately balanced between the higher education community and non-academics to insure that a broad spectrum of viewpoints be represented in group deliberations. Each group was assigned specific questions by the Management/Policy Group. In addition, each group was encouraged to address any other questions as it saw fit.

IV. Review and Evaluation Group: A group invited to review, evaluate, and make comments on the Resource Group reports and successive drafts of the Master Plan. Ten members represent a wide spectrum of the state's business and public interest activity and three ex-officio members are from state government.

V. Master Plan Staff Associates: Each of the constituent units of the public system and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges have provided staff support for the Master Plan project. The staff associates serve a dual function: (1) each staff associate provided staff assistance to a Resource Group and, subsequently, (2) the staff associates will, in collaboration with the Commission staff, prepare the draft of the Master Plan.

VI. Constituent Unit Boards of Trustees, Including Faculty, Students and Administration: All boards of trustees of the higher education system are asked to review carefully the Resource Group reports and the Master Plan drafts to follow. It is expected that each institution will encourage the fullest possible discussion among faculty, students, and administrators.

VII. The Public: In addition to the higher education constituencies noted above, a vital input to the Master Plan is the participation of all who are interested, including: individuals in industry, labor, minorities, professionals -- in short, all organizations and individuals interested in higher education. Comments are invited at any stage of the development of the Master Plan. However, for consideration for the initial draft of the Master Plan, comments must be received by April 1973 and in the final draft of the Master Plan by September 1973.

AN OUTLINE OF ACTIVITIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN

Activity	
1. CHE requests staff assistance from constituent units	6/72
2. CHE appoints Management/Policy Group	
3. Management/Policy Group:	
a. Identifies elements of Master Plan	
b. Develops queries to be addressed	
c. Appoints Resource Groups	
4. CHE holds Colloquium Orientation meeting	
5. CHE appoint Review and Evaluation Group	
6. CHE approves interim report for transmittal to Governor	12/72
7. Resource Groups complete and transmit papers to Management/ Policy Group	
8. Management/Policy Group distributes Resource Group reports to Constituent units, Review and Evaluation Group, and other interested groups and individuals	
9. Comments on Resource Group reports are submitted by Review and Evaluation Group, constituent units, and other interested individuals and groups	
10. Initial Draft of Master Plan is prepared and distributed to constituent units and Review and Evaluation Group	
11. Initial reactions are received and Draft of Master Plan is amended	
12. CHE sponsors public presentation of amended Draft of Master Plan and solicits comments from all groups and individuals who are interested	
13. Comments reviewed and evaluated and final draft prepared	
14. Management/Policy Group receives final comments on final Draft of Master Plan from constituent units and Review and Evaluation Group, reports to CHE	
15. CHE approves final draft of Master Plan and transmits it to the Governor and General Assembly	12/73

CONNECTICUT COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT OF RESOURCE GROUP VI - TRANSFER

Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs

February, 1973

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Middletown, Connecticut 06457

Office of the Provost

February 22, 1973

Mr. Donald H. McGannon
Chairman, Commission for Higher Education
c/o Westinghouse Electric Corporation
90 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Dear Mr. McGannon:

On behalf of Resource Group VI of the Master Plan for Higher Education I am pleased to submit to you the attached report on The Transfer of Students Among Institutions and Programs. It is our sincere hope that it will contribute positively to the very important task in which the Commission is engaged.

The members of the Resource Group have given generously of their time and effort in the past few months in the development of this report, and stand ready to convene again if needed in the next phases of the planning schedule.

Sincerely yours,

Edgar F. Beckham

Edgar F. Beckham
Associate Provost

/la

VI. TRANSFER: Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs

Chairman: Edgar F. Beckham, Dean of The College
Wesleyan University

Staff Associate: Brian H. Burke, Assistant to the Provost
University of Connecticut

Paul Beeching
Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mrs. Shirley Belluardo
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Miss Mary Brackett
Academic Dean
Norwalk Community College
Norwalk

Dominic Buonocore
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Dr. John R. Burton
Chairman, Business Administration Department
Manchester Community College
Manchester

Mrs. Ann Dickens
Assistant Director of Admissions
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Dr. Regina M. Duffy, President
Northwestern Connecticut Community College
Winsted

Ms. June Goodman
Danbury

Paul S. Hines
Chairman, Chemistry Department
Western Connecticut State College
Danbury

Errol F. Hosein
Board Member, C. A. D. U. A. W.
Hartford

Thomas A. Kelly
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Robert Lougee
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Charles Mathews
Student
Wesleyan University
Middletown

Thomas C. Mayers
Director of Community Relations
Olin Corporation
Stamford

Juan Ramos
Community Consultant
Connecticut Mental Health Center
New Haven

Harold Schwede
West Redding

Ms. Jacqueline Sulinski
Student
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The members of the Resource Group on Transfer wish to extend sincere thanks to the following people, who contributed in various ways to the development of this report. This acknowledgment does not necessarily imply their endorsement of the report.

Louise Astin
Secretary in the Office of the Provost
Wesleyan University

Merrily Baack
Director of Student Personnel
Middlesex Community College

Ernest Beals, Director of the
Office of Transfer Affairs
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Herman Beckert
Director of Admissions
Eastern Connecticut State College

Romeo Bernier
Connecticut Commission for
Higher Education

Gertrude Braun
Dean of Academic Studies
Western Connecticut State College

Harold Burke
Dean of Student Affairs
Western Connecticut State College

Barbara Hart
Assistant in Admissions
Central Connecticut State College

Robert Hewes
Dean of Students
The University of Connecticut

Richard Judd
Dean, Student Affairs
Central Connecticut State College

Frederick Kintzer, Vice Chairman
Department of Education
University of California,
Los Angeles

Howard Klebanoff
State Representative, 8th District
Hartford, Connecticut

Andrew McKirdy
Connecticut Regional Community
Colleges

Evann Middlebrooks
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Southern Connecticut State College

Charles Owen, Professor of English
Chairman, Scholastic Standards
Committee
The University of Connecticut

Gail Patrick, Counselor
Manchester Community College

Robert Porter
Director of Admissions
Southern Connecticut State College

Bernard Shea
Connecticut Commission for
Higher Education

Gilbert Teal
Dean of the College
Western Connecticut State College

Thomas Vitelli
Dean of Student Affairs
Southern Connecticut State College

Merrill Walrath
Director of Admissions
Western Connecticut State College

Warren Willingham
Access Research Office
College Entrance Examination Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	i
Members of Resource Group VI - Transfer	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Summary of Recommendations	1
INTRODUCTION	5
THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXAMPLE	12
Credit/Standing	12
Admission	21
Accommodation	23
APPLICATION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXAMPLE	26
IMPLEMENTATION	28
SUMMARY	30
Specific Questions and Answers	33
Bibliography	35

VI. Transfer: Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Resource Group on Transfer decided that the most productive use of its time would be to devote its principal efforts to the problems of Community College transfers, and from the specific recommendations pertaining thereto, develop general guidelines to be used for all other transfer cases.

It is recommended:

Credit/Standing

1. When a graduate from a transfer curriculum of a Connecticut Regional Community College is admitted to a bachelor's degree granting public institution in Connecticut primarily on the basis of performance in the transfer curriculum, he should receive full credit at the receiving institution for all courses within the transfer curriculum of the sending institution for which a passing grade was assigned.
2. Recommendation 1 should be construed to include credits assigned within the transfer curriculum by the sending college for academic work taken at another institution.
3. All institutions should review their general education and course distribution requirements and assess their effect on transfer students.
4. Those institution-wide general education requirements which are taken predominantly by lower division students of the institution and which take the form of specific courses should be waived for Community College graduates of transfer programs.
5. When substantial changes are made or planned in baccalaureate programs, notice and explanation of such changes should be forwarded to institutions likely to be preparing students for entry into such programs.

6. To the extent feasible, the determination of satisfactory completion of prerequisite academic work should be made on the basis of a student's mastery of essential elements of the subject matter and not solely on the basis of the similarity of catalog course descriptions.

Admission

7. Every Connecticut resident who earns an associate degree in a transfer curriculum from a Connecticut Regional Community College should be guaranteed admission to one of the bachelor's degree programs at a Connecticut public institution.

8. Among all applicants to restricted curricula--those which, due to the need for laboratories, clinical affiliations, or other limiting factors, have an enrollment ceiling--priority should be given to qualified graduates of Connecticut Community Colleges over other transfer applicants.

9. Program planning at institutions which receive transfer students should include specific consideration of the number of students anticipated from the Regional Community Colleges.

Accommodation

10. The calendar of matriculation routines which begins with the submission of an application for admission should be reorganized in such a way as to insure that transfer students have an opportunity to register for courses and programs on an equal footing with other students and have equal access to such services and resources as counseling and advising, financial aid, and housing. Pending the completion of the calendar reorganization, resources and services such as enrollment spaces in courses and programs, and financial aid funds should be held in reserve in appropriate amounts for entering transfer students.

11. The terms of a transfer student's admission should be made as explicit and as comprehensive as possible and be communicated to the student as early as possible. The "admission contract" should state clearly the different categories of requirements which pertain to the program the student will enter and specify the extent to which the student has met the requirements in each category. It should also outline the services and resources (advising, counseling, course registration, financial aid, housing, and the like) which will be available to the students and indicate when and where they may be obtained.

12. Orientation programs which take into account the special needs of transfer students should be planned and implemented by all institutions which receive transfer students.

13. Budgets for student services should be increased to provide adequately for the needs of transfer students.

14. Institutional leadership should be exerted to raise academic advising to a higher order of importance, and to see that the number and preparedness of faculty assigned and the time allotted is sufficient for the registration needs of all students.

Recommendations for Implementation

15. The Commission for Higher Education should establish a Transfer Coordinating Committee with representation from Regional Community Colleges, State Colleges, the University of Connecticut, State Technical Colleges, and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. The Committee should be charged with the following responsibilities:

    a. Submission of an annual report to the Commission on the movement of transfer students into and out of institutions of higher education in Connecticut.

b. Regular monitoring of the transfer process and identification of transfer problems.

c. Recommendation to the Commission and to the appropriate institutions for changes in transfer policy and procedures.

d. Development, by the first biennial revision of the Master Plan, of an agreement among institutions of higher education in Connecticut on the interpretation of standardized examinations such as CLEP.

e. Investigation of problems of articulation between proprietary schools and other post-secondary institutions.

16. Each institution of higher education in Connecticut should appoint a transfer liaison officer who will be responsible for monitoring the movement of transfer students into and out of the institution and for maintaining effective communication with the Transfer Coordinating Committee.

17. The Commission for Higher Education should appoint to its staff an officer to serve as "ombudsman" in individual transfer disputes.

18. The Commission for Higher Education, with the assistance of the Transfer Coordinating Committee, should prepare periodic estimates of the number of Community College transfer students likely to select each baccalaureate program offered at public four-year institutions.

19. The Commission for Higher Education should take the lead in stimulating and encouraging closer inter-institutional communication and cooperation within academic disciplines.

INTRODUCTION

During the past ten years the transfer of students among institutions and programs has become a prominent aspect of American higher education. Nationally, it is estimated that more than a half-million students a year are moving from one college to another. In Connecticut, transfer students accounted in the Fall of 1972 for roughly 30% of the new undergraduate enrollments in the State's public four-year institutions. The "transfer boom," as the phenomenon has been called, has brought with it a host of problems, some of them simply procedural, others complex and interwoven with fundamental educational issues.

Transfer problems usually come to the attention of the general public as individual grievances which, at least in the view of the aggrieved, are susceptible of easy solution. On the other hand, representatives of institutions which are called upon to accept an increasing number of transfer students may perceive the same transfer problems as a threat to the integrity of the educational enterprise. Students argue that they should be able to transfer all their credits from one institution to another, while receiving institutions reserve the right to scrutinize each credit individually. Students claim that receiving institutions are often arbitrary, even capricious, in imposing "lower division" general education requirements on "upper division" transfer students, while the institutions assert that their special requirements must be met by all students if the degree which the institution awards is to retain its character and significance. Transfer students complain that they are placed at a disadvantage by receiving institutions in such matters as the selection of courses and the distribution of financial

aid, while the institutions argue the legitimacy of their prior obligation to so-called "native" students. There is a strong tendency among neutral observers to side with the complaining student in these cases. In the first place, the student is usually speaking about a specific concrete situation, whereas institutional counter-arguments are generally abstract and often vague. Secondly, it is probably the case that only the more blatant examples of transfer "injustice" reach the ear of the public. A third factor affecting the drift of public sentiment toward the transfer student is the growing awareness among lay people that the recent increase in the diversity and flexibility of educational policies, procedures, and standards is inconsistent with an apparent institutional rigidity in transfer matters. And finally, taxpayers whose tax dollars have gone to support a network of public institutions that is supposed to provide multiple entries to higher education are understandably distressed to learn that once entry has been gained, further progress is blocked or seriously impeded.

The Master Plan Resource Group on the Transfer of Students Among Institutions and Programs has sought to take a deliberately pragmatic view of transfer problems. Though sensitive to the abstract issues of educational "ideology" which are often invoked in support of both sides of a transfer controversy, the Resource Group concluded that, however such profound conflicts might eventually be resolved, it remains the practical and compelling mandate of higher education in Connecticut to meet the growing challenges posed by the increase in student diversity and mobility, the widening range of educational needs within society, and the accelerating rate at which those needs are changing. Transfer problems illustrate the challenges in a dramatic way.

The Resource Group on Transfer believes that the recent history of higher education in Connecticut supports our conclusion that educational institutions have a practical mandate to become more receptive to transfer students. The development in recent years of a system of Regional Community Colleges in Connecticut should be viewed as the State's early response to the challenge of student diversity and mobility. By providing a network of institutions of different sizes, styles, levels, locations and educational objectives the State has sought to answer the question, "How do I get into higher education in Connecticut?" In the Resource Group's view the obvious sequel to the State's answer is another question, namely, "Now that I'm in, how do I get from one step to the next?"

Very early in its deliberations the Resource Group determined that it should focus on a relatively narrow range of transfer problems. It recognized at the outset that the range of transfer difficulties, viewed from the vantage point of students attempting to transfer, was probably as extensive as the range of specific human circumstances that might prompt such attempts. For example, a student who has almost completed a two-year occupational curriculum in a community college may decide that she wants to become a psychologist; or a student from a proprietary school in another state may move to Connecticut and want to continue his education at the University of Connecticut; or a housewife with older children may wish to apply fragments of formal educational experience stretching back over fifteen years to a degree program at Central Connecticut State College; or a returning veteran may seek to receive credit toward a bachelor's degree for some educational experience gained during military service. The Resource Group also acknowledged

that the approach to each individual transfer problem was likely to be a function of several factors, including the specific educational objective of the transfer student, the style and level of the "sending" and "receiving" institutions, the content and quality of the student's previous academic record, the elapsed time between the student's departure from the sending institution and the filing of his transfer application. Given the complex way in which individual transfer circumstances intersect the factors affecting transfer decisions, it is reasonable to assert that the variety of individual transfer problems is practically infinite. The Resource Group concluded therefore that the process of accommodating student movement among institutions and programs will necessarily continue to depend on the application of informed professional judgment to individual cases, and that no set of rigid guidelines, however ingeniously conceived, would be sufficient. But at the same time, the Resource Group agreed that professional judgment could be guided in the direction of more judicious application than currently obtains, and that while we could not specify comprehensive policies which would cover all transfer cases, we might well attempt to isolate a category of transfer problems and to provide a coherent approach to their alleviation. The Resource Group regards its approach to the category which follows as exemplary for all others.

The Community College Example

The Resource Group chose as its primary focus the transfer of graduates of "transfer curricula" at a Connecticut Regional Community College to a four-year public institution in the State. In selecting Community College transfers as its "example," the Resource Group was guided by a number of considerations:

(1) Students who enter a transfer curriculum at a Regional Community College may legitimately expect that upon successful completion of the program, they will be able to transfer to a four-year institution.

(2) Within community colleges and four-year public institutions there is a growing awareness of "articulation" problems and a developing motivation to solve them.

(3) The cooperative efforts of these institutions have already led to an easing of some transfer difficulties.

(4) Since the institutions are all part of an organized approach to higher education in a single small state, they ought to know each other more intimately and have a fuller appreciation of each other's needs and resources. They should therefore be in a position to sustain a flexible and effective articulation process with relative ease.

It is important to reiterate that the Resource Group does not view its recommendations as rigid guidelines that will determine institutional decisions in all cases, but rather as a frame of reference which may lead to consistent institutional behavior within a limited context and thus foster realistic expectations among potential transfer students within the same context. The Resource Group rejects categorically the notion that equitable delivery of educational services can be achieved through the unbending application of quantifiable measurements. On the contrary, we believe that "equal treatment" in education requires sensitivity to individual needs, and that an educational system which is unwilling to make exceptions to its quantified "rules" on grades, credits

and other measures of achievement, is unsound educationally as well as socially. Our recommendations should apply therefore only to such cases in which the conditions stipulated in the recommendations are met. In cases where the conditions are not met, institutions should be encouraged to exercise careful and sensitive judgment based on an assessment of their own capacity to render educational services and the capacity of the potential transfer student to exploit in a productive way the resources of the institution. To be specific, when the Resource Group recommends that graduates of transfer curricula at Community Colleges should be admitted to a four-year institution, it is not suggesting that non-graduates should be rejected. It is stating that beyond the range of conditions specified in its recommendations, it chooses to remain silent on the matter of how an institution should behave.

The Data Gap

In conducting its inquiry into the nature and scope of the transfer problem in Connecticut, the Resource Group has consulted as many sources of information as time has allowed. We have met with administrators and faculty members from the public institutions of higher education in the state, conducted a survey of transfer procedures used at public and private institutions, considered the available data on the performance of transfer students at receiving institutions in Connecticut, consulted with transfer experts in other states, analyzed articulation agreements in force or under consideration in other states, and studied the work of earlier transfer committees in Connecticut. In addition, individual members of the Resource Group have interviewed students, faculty and administrators at their own institutions.

The Resource Group's best efforts do not constitute a comprehensive study of the problem, not only because of lack of time, but more importantly because of lack of data. There is currently no mechanism in higher education in Connecticut which monitors adequately the movement of students among institutions and programs. As a result, it is not possible to assess accurately the effectiveness of current transfer policies, to gauge the impact of projected policy changes, nor for that matter, even to determine what happens educationally to those students who decide to transfer. Many of them do not transfer within the state. If we knew more about those who do not, we would be in a much better position to evaluate Connecticut's success in the transfer process.

The Resource Group's first recommendation is that the data gap be closed. We are convinced that higher education needs a mechanism for monitoring and adjusting the transfer process on an on-going basis. Our recommendation for the establishment of such a mechanism later in this report is based on the assumption that comprehensive data on the movement of students within higher education will be available. If data are not available, the mechanism will falter.

Organization of the Report

The body of the report consists of discussions of the Resource Group's specific recommendations. The first group of recommendations concerns what we call the "Community College Example." It is divided into three parts: credit/standing, admission, and accommodation. It is followed by a set of recommendations which outlines ways in which we think the Community College Example can and should be applied to other categories of transfer problems. The next set of recommendations

develops a set of implementation strategies. The final section summarizes the Resource Group's findings.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXAMPLE

Credit/Standing

No other topic of discussion occupied so much of the Resource Group's time as did the issue of the transfer of academic credit and the determination of academic standing. The issue is difficult and sensitive because it is so closely tied to the problem of institutional autonomy. The desire of an educational institution to exercise exclusive responsibility for its own programs and products often goes hand in hand with a reluctance to take responsibility for what another institution may have accomplished. As a result, the assigning of transfer credit inevitably generates questions of whether the academic program of one institution is "the same as," "equivalent to" or "sufficient for" the program of another. In the view of the Resource Group the emphasis on comparative program quality is misplaced. To begin with, questions of comparative quality are easy to raise, but extremely difficult to answer adequately. Moreover, the primary focus of institutional attention in transfer matters should be on the individual transfer student's potential for continued educational growth as demonstrated through performance in a generally appropriate curriculum, rather than on the details of curriculum content.

There are three principles which inform the Resource Group's recommendations on credit and standing:

(1) Continuity. Transfer policies should enhance the opportunity for smooth transition from one educational level to the next in programs which may appropriately involve more than one institution.

(2) Equity. The assignment of transfer credit and the determination of academic standing should be equitable.

(3) Efficiency. Transfer policies should foster productive use of student time and institutional resources by discouraging unnecessary interruptions and repetitions in a student's program.

Much of the problem that now exists in the transfer of credit is due to ineffective communication. Academic terminology in this area has apparently not kept pace with the growing diversity and complexity of the curricular patterns which students may follow. Perhaps there were once some "good ol' days" when all students within a given institution traveled the same learning route in lock-step and when such designations as "sophomore" or "junior" or "seventy-two semester-hours of academic credit" were precise measures of the distance separating the student from fulfillment of the requirements for graduation. If there were such days, they are gone. Today, the term "semester" still designates a stretch of time, but no longer implies an ordained number of sequence of courses. As a result of the establishment of flexible curricular patterns a student just beginning his "junior year" may require more or less than two years for the completion of baccalaureate degree requirements.

The confusion begins to subside when it is recognized that degree requirements are multiple rather than singular, and that the partial fulfillment of one requirement no longer implies proportionate fulfillment

of the others. If a student's progress toward a degree could be displayed on giant thermometers, the way United Way fund drives often depict their achievement, then at least three separate thermometers would be required. In answer to the question, "How far along are you in your education," the savvy student would not longer answer, "I'm starting my junior year," or, "I've got sixty credits," but rather, "I'm at 50% on Thermometer I, 90% on Thermometer II, and 20% on Thermometer III." The questioner would understand that the student had accumulated half the number of units of credit required for graduation, had met most of the separate and distinct requirements in the area of general education, and had made modest progress in the areas of academic concentration (major and minor).

The variety of educational opportunities currently available in this country makes it possible for a student to accumulate a large number of credits without necessarily making much progress toward meeting the other categories of requirements. It often happens that students and institutions place so much emphasis on credit that the other requirements are neglected and students move through an educational program with seriously defective expectations.

It may be argued that the "three-thermometer method" of measuring academic achievement is cumbersome and frivolous. The Resource Group agrees that it is cumbersome, but we would argue that, though the image of three painted thermometers all in a row lacks the somber propriety of the traditional academic idiom, it at least has the advantage of saying rather precisely what it means.

Most of the Resource Group's recommendations in this section deal with transfer credit barriers which have often been defended as a

protection against the erosion of quality. We view the maintenance of inflexible transfer barriers as a negative approach to the problem of maintaining quality. We advocate an approach based on a cooperative arrangement in which two-year and four-year institutions see themselves as having a vested interest in the quality of each other's programs.

Although cooperation is an ideal toward which all educational institutions should strive, it is a particularly compelling imperative for public institutions in Connecticut. The relationship between public community colleges and public four-year institutions should be one of partnership. Connecticut's community colleges were created with a variety of missions, one of which was the preparation of students in transfer or "college parallel" curricula. Not only has much attention been paid by the Community Colleges to the transfer function, but their transfer programs have been specifically tailored to resemble the lower division offerings of the public four-year institutions in the state. They have not only continuously revised these offerings to follow the changes of the four-year institutions, but have had to weigh and balance the cues of many masters, public and private. We believe, therefore, that our recommendations are not only justified on the grounds of continuity, equity, and efficiency, but that they are also timely. While some difficulties and confusion are inevitable, the current posture and capabilities of the Community Colleges should keep such problems at a minimum.

Recommendations on the Assignment of Units of Credit

It is recommended that:

1. When a graduate from a transfer curriculum* of a Connecticut Regional Community College is admitted to a bachelor's degree granting public institution in Connecticut primarily on the basis of performance in the transfer curriculum, he should receive full credit at the receiving institution for all courses within the transfer curriculum of the sending institution for which a passing grade was assigned.
2. Recommendation 1 should be construed to include credits assigned within the transfer curriculum by the sending college for academic work taken at another institution.

Discussion of Recommendations 1 and 2

Recommendation 1 refers only to the accumulation of units of academic credit (Thermometer I). Whether the credits given also satisfy general education or concentration requirements will be discussed in a later section. The principal issue confronted in this recommendation is the granting of credit for courses in which the grade of "D" was assigned by

* The Resource Group anticipated some difficulty in defining a "transfer curriculum." However, our examination of the licensing procedures used in Connecticut for certifying new institutions and programs revealed that the procedures include a careful examination of program content in the context of stated program objectives. That is, community college programs which are designed to prepare students for transfer to baccalaureate programs are licensed in terms of that objective. It is reasonable, therefore, to define "transfer curriculum" as one which has been licensed by the Commission for Higher Education to pursue transfer objectives. In disputed cases, the judgment of the Commission can readily be sought.

The recommendation is not meant to discourage enrollment in baccalaureate programs of students who have completed "non-transfer" occupational programs at community colleges. The Resource Group has not included a recommendation covering the transfer of academic credit in such cases.

the sending college. In the deliberations concerning this issue the Resource Group discussed both the dimensions and the nature of the problem and arrived at two conclusions. First, the recommendation does not imply the granting of credit for vast amounts of poor work nor the admitting of "D students." The admission criteria currently in use at public four-year institutions make it unlikely that many "D's" will appear in the record of students who are admitted. Second, the question which the Resource Group addressed was not whether an institution should grant credit for marginal academic work, but rather whether it should assume arbitrarily that marginal work at another institution was necessarily of lower quality than marginal performance by its own students. The Resource Group concluded that grades were not a precise enough measure of academic performance to warrant the categorical exclusion of "D's" for credit accumulation purposes.

In our discussions with representatives of four-year colleges we discovered that the refusal of credit for "D" grades was often used to prevent students from electing a more advanced course in the same area. The Resource Group rejects that practice and would urge receiving institutions to substitute proper guidance. If it is feared that a student who received a "D" in introductory chemistry will falter in an advanced chemistry course, the student should be so advised.

It should be restated that the recommendation at this point refers only to the Connecticut Community College graduate of a transfer curriculum. Suggestions regarding applying this idea to other transfer students admitted on the basis of academic work at other institutions will follow below. Also, we realize that students are often admitted on grounds other than academic performance, an example being a returning

veteran who may have left formal education with a poor record several years ago. The Resource Group believes that in such cases institutional judgment regarding transfer credit is the more appropriate guide.

The Resource Group considered making a recommendation on the treatment of standardized examinations such as the College Level Examination Program (CLEP). Community Colleges currently grant academic credit in transfer curricula for satisfactory performance on some CLEP examinations. It may be argued that a community college graduate who has received credit by examination in the context of a transfer curriculum should not be denied the credit by a receiving institution. Most members of the Resource Group would endorse that argument as a general proposition, but we were concerned about the difficulty which seems to attend its application to specific cases. The educational community in Connecticut has not reached agreement on the appropriate interpretation of performance on CLEP examinations. The Resource Group therefore recommends that the matter of standardized examinations receive further study.

General Education and Distribution Requirements

In addition to the mere accumulation of units of credit, the earning of a degree often requires that the credits and courses be distributed so as to insure a broad educational background. Our interest here, again consistent with continuity, equity, and efficiency is essentially two-fold. First, the degree of fullness of Thermometer II as distinct from other requirements should be made clear upon transfer. Second, since the Community Colleges stress general education in much the same manner as do the four-year institutions, the particular pattern of the requirements at the receiving institution should not impede the direct

movement toward the degree for community college transfers. The nature of the requirements should be such that most, if not all, can be fulfilled in the associate degree program. Those that remain should be accessible to any upper division student without interfering with his pursuit of a concentration program. To illustrate, if an institution requires all fourth year students to take a particular course for which there are no specific prerequisites, no hardship is placed upon the community college transfer. However, if entry to the required course can be gained only by taking other courses offered only in that institution's lower division, a hardship does exist, and the transfer student is at a serious disadvantage.

Recommendations on General Education and Distribution Requirements

3. All institutions should review their general education and course distribution requirements and assess their effect on transfer students.
4. Those institution-wide general education requirements which are taken predominantly by lower division students of the institution and which take the form of specific courses should be waived for Community College graduates of transfer programs.

Discussion of Recommendations 3 and 4.

The principal issue raised in the discussion leading to these recommendations was that of institutional autonomy and integrity. In none of its recommendations does the Resource Group intend to compromise the right of an institution to determine its own curriculum. On the other hand, we would assert that no single curricular route to such a

broad objective as "general education" can rightfully claim exclusive validity. In other words, underlying the recommendations on general education is a conviction that institutions must go beyond the mere "accommodation" of transfer students who have not had an opportunity to meet specific general education or course distribution requirements. It calls upon receiving institutions to acknowledge the validity and suitability of programs which are different in detail from their own and urges them to evaluate incoming transfer students in the context of the programs from which the students have emerged, rather than exclusively in terms of the program which the students are entering. Such an evaluation procedure, which not only assesses a student's competence to meet the demands of a new program, but also respects the coherence of his prior educational experience, is particularly appropriate in the case of transfer students from Connecticut Community Colleges, where the emphasis on general education in transfer curricula is substantial.

Concentration Program Requirements

Though the Resource Group recognizes that the departmental sponsors of major (or minor) programs have the primary responsibility for program design and implementation, we believe that the sponsors should be sensitive to the needs of transfer students. Many students enter a community college fully intending to transfer into a baccalaureate program at another institution. They may map out a community college course of study using the catalog of a particular four-year institution as a guide, only to find two years later that the catalog has been changed and that a new set of prerequisites for entry into the desired field of study is required of all entering students. It can happen that a receiving

institution will waive new requirements for its own continuing students, but neglect to do so for incoming transfer students.

The Resource Group also considered the problem which results when major program sponsors evaluate transfer students by comparing course descriptions rather than measuring competence.

Recommendations on Concentration Program Requirements

It is recommended that:

5. When substantial changes are made or planned in baccalaureate programs, notice and explanation of such changes should be forwarded to institutions likely to be preparing students for entry into such programs.
6. To the extent feasible, the determination of satisfactory completion of prerequisite academic work should be made on the basis of a student's mastery of essential elements of the subject matter and not solely on the basis of the similarity of catalog course descriptions.

Admission

The recommendations of the preceding section referred to the student admitted from a community college transfer curriculum. This section pertains to policies and priorities underlying the admission process. Admission procedures will be discussed in a later section.

The Resource Group's recommendations regarding admission policies rest on the principle that a student's progress from a transfer program at a state Community College to a baccalaureate program at a State College or the University of Connecticut should be regarded as a planned continuation of his program.

Recommendations on Admission Policy

It is recommended that:

7. Every Connecticut resident who earns an associate degree in a transfer curriculum from a Connecticut Regional Community College should be guaranteed admission to one of the bachelor's degree programs at a Connecticut public institution.
8. Among all applicants to restricted curricula--those which, due to the need for laboratories, clinical affiliations, or other limiting factors, have an enrollment ceiling--priority should be given to qualified graduates of Connecticut Community Colleges over other transfer applicants.
9. Program planning at institutions which receive transfer students should include specific consideration of the number of students anticipated from the Regional Community Colleges.

Discussion of Recommendations 7 and 8

It should be noted that the Board of Trustees of Connecticut's State Colleges approved a resolution on December 8, 1972 which guarantees admission of all qualified graduates of Regional Community Colleges to a public four-year baccalaureate program. Further, although the University of Connecticut was not a party to the resolution, it already extends first priority in transfer admissions to applicants from Regional Community Colleges. The Resource Group wishes, through its recommendation, to underscore its support of these developments.

Accommodation

If all problems of admission and credit policy were resolved, the book on transfer problems would be far from closed. A whole range of difficulties, many very important, would still exist in procedures, calendars, routines and the provision of necessary services. By way of analogy, a music enthusiast might feel quite content after having purchased a ticket to hear his favorite symphony, played by his favorite orchestra, at his favorite hall, on his first choice of nights. But if upon arriving he found no place to park, crowds queued up before a single ticket taker, his seat (or what he had thought was his seat) taken, and if he did not get settled until halfway through the first movement, he would probably consider his evening less than successful. The needs of transfer students go beyond admission and the assignment of appropriate credit. The transition from one institutional environment to another involves problems of adjustment which can be relieved substantially through the provision of supportive services and the institution of more realistic procedures.

The Resource Group's discussion of accommodation practices with representatives of four-year institutions revealed that a pattern of discrimination against transfer students does exist. Insensitivity and inappropriate timing appear to be the main culprits. Either key administrators and faculty members at the four-year colleges, and to some extent at the two-year colleges also, are not as aware as they should be of special problems transfer students encounter, or the calendar of matriculation routines is arranged in such a way as to favor "native" continuing students and freshmen over transfer students. In general, as stated by one of the representatives of the State Colleges, the policies

and procedures currently used in connection with transfer students were appropriate a decade ago, but with the increase in student mobility and specifically the emergence of a system of community colleges these policies have become outdated and ineffective.

Recommendations on Accommodation

10. The calendar of matriculation routines which begins with the submission of an application for admission should be reorganized in such a way as to insure that transfer students have an opportunity to register for courses and programs on an equal footing with other students and have equal access to such services and resources as counseling and advising, financial aid, and housing. Pending the completion of the calendar reorganization, resources and services such as enrollment spaces in courses and programs, and financial aid funds should be held in reserve in appropriate amounts for entering transfer students.

11. The terms of a transfer student's admission should be made as explicit and as comprehensive as possible and be communicated to the student as early as possible. The "admission contract" should state clearly the different categories of requirements which pertain to the program the student will enter and specify the extent to which the student has met the requirements in each category. It should also outline the services and resources (advising, counseling, course registration, financial aid, housing, and the like) which will be available to the students and indicate when and where they may be obtained.

12. Orientation programs which take into account the special needs of transfer students should be planned and implemented by all institutions which receive transfer students.

13. Budgets for student services should be increased to provide adequately for the needs of transfer students.

14. Institutional leadership should be exerted to raise academic advising to a higher order of importance, and to see that the number and preparedness of faculty assigned and the time allotted is sufficient for the registration needs of all students.

Discussion of Recommendations 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14

Recommendation 10 is intended to enable potential transfer students to begin the process of transition from a community college to a four-year institution earlier than is currently possible. If the interval between notification of admission and the start of classes were longer, transfer students would have more time for planning a course of study, consulting with advisers and counselors at the receiving institution, and generally preparing for matriculation.

Recommendation 11 is based on the Resource Group's discussion of a phenomenon referred to by several transfer experts as "transfer shock," the sudden drop in academic performance which is often noted among transfer students in the first term at the receiving institution. Usually the recovery pattern in the second term is dramatic, which leads many observers to conclude that problems of initial adjustment underlie the academic difficulties. The Resource Group believes that transfer shock is related to the defective expectations which many transfer

students bring with them. As we have suggested earlier in this report, the problem is one of faulty communication. For instance, a prospective transfer student who expects to be designated a "junior" upon entry into a receiving institution may enjoy a momentary sense of pleasure when that status is conferred upon him and then feel frustrated when he learns that junior status does not necessarily mean that he will receive a bachelor's degree after two more years of study. Indeed, at one institution in Connecticut the term "junior" appears to have more to do with parking privileges than with academic standing.

APPLICATION OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE EXAMPLE

While the Community College transfer student has been used in this report as a model in recommending guidelines for the granting of transfer credit and the establishment of procedures for assimilation of transfer students into the receiving institutions, the Resource Group believes that the underlying intent of the recommendations should be applied to all transfer students. Thus, for example, the student moving from one Connecticut public four-year institution to another, or the student coming into Connecticut from an accredited two or four-year institution outside the state should be given the opportunity to continue his education with the least possible disruption. His transcript should be evaluated in the same spirit and the interpretation of general education requirements should be applied in the same way as we have suggested for community college transfers.

Since it is not feasible to prescribe specific transfer policies which could be applied usefully to all kinds of transfer students, the Resource Group has chosen not to make formal recommendations in this section of the report. On the other hand, our recommendations on Community College transfers have some general implications which deserve emphasis:

1. Transfer students, from whatever source, who are admitted to public or private institutions of higher education in Connecticut should receive full academic credit for their previous academic work. Credit should be denied only if the level of performance was lower than that required for credit in courses taken at the receiving institution, or if there is evidence that the content of particular courses was demonstrably inferior to that of courses offered at the receiving institution.
2. Receiving institutions should not require transfer students in bachelor's degree programs to take lower division courses in fulfillment of institution-wide general education requirements, provided that all the following conditions are met:
    a. the transfer student is admitted with at least half the number of credits required for the baccalaureate degree.
    b. the distribution of course work in the student's program at the sending institution is reasonable in terms of the sending institution's "general education" expectations.
    c. the "general education" expectations of the sending institution are expressive of thoughtful concern for educational breadth.

3. Lower division courses which are normally required for entry into a concentration program should not be required of transfer students who can demonstrate mastery of those portions of the subject matter which are deemed essential for successful completion of the program.
4. All transfer students should have ready access to the resources and services appropriate to their educational needs.

IMPLEMENTATION

The Resource Group began its consideration of the problem of implementation by identifying a set of "implementation functions," that is, processes which would have to occur if the recommendations were to be applied effectively. Five such functions were identified:

1. Data collection and analysis.
2. Regular monitoring of transfer policies and procedures.
3. The improvement of communication among institutions of higher education, particularly public institutions.
4. Adjudication of individual transfer grievances.
5. Formal approval of the recommendations of the Resource Group.

Recommendations on Implementation

It is recommended that:

15. The Commission for Higher Education should establish a Transfer Coordinating Committee with representation from Regional Community Colleges, State Colleges, the University of

Connecticut, State Technical Colleges, and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. The Committee should be charged with the following responsibilities:

a. Submission of an annual report to the Commission on the movement of transfer students into and out of institutions of higher education in Connecticut.

b. Regular monitoring of the transfer process and identification of transfer problems.

c. Recommendation to the Commission and to the appropriate institutions for changes in transfer policy and procedures.

d. Development, by the first biennial revision of the Master Plan of an agreement among institutions of higher education in Connecticut on the interpretation of standardized examinations such as CLEP.

e. Investigation of problems of articulation between proprietary schools and other post-secondary institutions.

16. Each institution of higher education in Connecticut should appoint a transfer liaison officer who will be responsible for monitoring the movement of transfer students into and out of the institution and for maintaining effective communication with the Transfer Coordinating Committee.

17. The Commission for Higher Education should appoint to its staff an officer to serve as "ombudsman" in individual transfer disputes.

18. The Commission for Higher Education, with the assistance of the Transfer Coordinating Committee, should prepare periodic estimates of the number of Community College transfer students likely to select each baccalaureate program offered at public four-year institutions.

19. The Commission for Higher Education should take the lead in stimulating and encouraging closer inter-institutional communication and cooperation within academic disciplines.

SUMMARY

The Recommendations on Implementation describe a mechanism for continuing the work of the Resource Group. The Resource Group has attempted to isolate a category of transfer problems, those involving graduates from transfer curricula at Regional Community Colleges, and to demonstrate, through its recommendations and discussions, that the transfer process in the selected category can be eased substantially. The recommendations are aimed specifically at removing the current barriers that impede smooth transition from a transfer curriculum at a Regional Community College to a baccalaureate program at a four-year institution. Though the recommendations cover such basic problems as the assignment of credit earned in courses, admission priorities, and the quality of student services, some important issues, such as the acquisition of credit by standardized examination have not been adequately treated.

It is also the case that the application of the Community College Example to other kinds of transfers needs regular monitoring and testing.

It needs to be extended to cover transfer areas which the Resource Group was unable to investigate, such as transfers from proprietary schools.

It is the hope of the Resource Group that the Transfer Coordinating Committee will take up these and related issues promptly.

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

a. What are current policies of transfer between public institutions of higher learning in Connecticut?

Until recently there were as many policies as there were institutions. However, there has been recent movement toward uniformity. The policies are sketched as follows:

The State Colleges. As of December 8, 1972, the Board of Trustees policy is that all recommended graduates of transfer programs of Connecticut Regional Community Colleges are to be guaranteed admission to some program at a State College. Other transfer applicants compete on the basis of academic record and date of application.

The University of Connecticut. Among all transfer applicants first priority is extended to qualified graduates of Connecticut Regional Community Colleges. To be qualified one must be completing a transfer curriculum and have the recommendation of the sending college. Other transfer applicants compete on the basis of their academic records with priority usually going to those completing two years of work.

b. What are the problems of such policies as seen by students, public, and administrators and what changes should be made to improve them?

The principal problems of recent years have not been in admission, but rather in the assignment of credit and standing and the provision of student personnel services. The basis of most of the problems are insensitivity, the timing of matriculation routines, and a fundamental lack of communication regarding the academic requirements of different institutions. Several specific recommendations are made in the full report.

c. What guidelines should be applied for transfer of credit among accredited institutions? From unaccredited to accredited?

The Resource Group has provided detailed discussion and recommendations concerning what it has called "the Community College Example."

The assignment of credit from all accredited institutions should follow the principles of that model.

The assignment of credit from unaccredited institutions should be left to the discretion of the receiving institution.

d. Under what condition should an associate degree earned at a 2-year community college be acceptable in toto for admission to a 4-year college, just as a high school diploma is an admission ticket to college?

All students earning an associate degree in a transfer program from a Connecticut Regional Community College should be guaranteed admission to one of the bachelor's degree programs of the public institutions of Connecticut. The reader is referred to the recommendation on Admission in the "Community College Example" of the report.

e. What problems, if any, exist with respect to the transfer of pass/fail credit or credits earned by examination?

Currently the transfer of credit for pass/fail courses varies with every institution. In the development of the "Community College Example" the Resource Group has recommended that for graduates of transfer curricula credit be awarded for all courses with a passing grade. The reader is referred to the section on Credit/Standing in the full report.

Credits earned from an examination prepared by a department for a specific course do not usually present a problem. However, there is little or no agreement about credits earned on nationally standardized examinations such as CLEP. The Resource Group did not try to resolve this problem. It is our recommendation that one of the tasks for the proposed Transfer Coordinating Committee is to promote an agreement among institutions on the matter by the first biennial revision of the Master Plan.

f. How many students transferred to senior public institutions of higher education in 1970? 71? 72? How many are anticipated by 1979? What are the sources of these transfer students?

Estimated transfers to senior institutions in Connecticut:

	Fall 1970	Fall 1971	Fall 1972
Public	1950	2313	3024
Private	1625	1725	1797

In recent years, statewide, spring admission has involved approximately 40% of the number of transfers of the subsequent fall admission.

Community College officials indicate that the percentage of their students who intend to transfer does not appear to be changing significantly. Using this as an indicator might lead to the prediction of a stable rate of transfer. However, there is not sufficient data on the future of total enrollments to be able to project the number of future transfers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Document	Author or Source
The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges	The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970
The No. 2 Access Problem: Transfer to the Upper Division	Warren W. Willingham, Access Research Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Palo Alto, California, July, 1972. (Office now in Princeton, New Jersey.)
Study of Massachusetts Two-Year College Students: Implications for Massachusetts Four-Year Colleges and Universities	Massachusetts State Transfer Articulation Committee, The University of Massachusetts, Amherst, August, 1972
Policy Recommendation for Facilitating Student Mobility in Massachusetts Public Higher Education	Massachusetts Transfer Review Council, January 11, 1973
Recommendations of the Task Force on Transfer, 1970	Connecticut Commission for Higher Education
Resolution Concerning Transfer of Students to the State College in Connecticut, December, 1972	Board of Trustees for the State Colleges, 1280 Asylum Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut
Policies and Guidelines for Transfer of Students from the Regional Community Colleges to the State Colleges, January 6, 1967	The Board of Trustees for the State Colleges, 1280 Asylum Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut
The Transfer Boom: 500,000 a Year are Switching Colleges	The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 2, 1972
University Community College Articulation: A Progress Report and Action Proposals from the Esso Education Foundation UCLA Project, July 7, 1972	Frederick C. Kintzer, Associate Professor of Higher Education and Vice-Chairman, Department of Education, The University of California, Los Angeles
Connecticut Community Colleges, 1972	Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges, 1280 Asylum Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut

Changing Needs in Transfer Admission: Build Policy from the Data

Brian H. Burke, College and University, the Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Winter, 1973

Articulation Agreement Between the State Universities and Public Junior Colleges in Florida, April 5, 1971

State University System of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida